

Moulton (R. G.)

ADDRESS

OF

RICHARD G. MOULTON, A.M.,  
OF CAMBRIDGE, ENG.,

ON THE

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION  
MOVEMENT.

---

PUBLISHED BY  
THE AMERICAN SOCIETY  
FOR THE  
EXTENSION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHING,  
1602 CHESTNUT STREET,  
PHILADELPHIA.





## ADDRESS OF R. G. MOULTON, A.M.,

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION LECTURER IN LITERATURE.

(Delivered before the American Society for the Extension of  
University Teaching, November 19th, 1890.)

MR. PROVOST, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN :—

I am invited to lay before you the facts of the University Extension movement in England. Only side by side with the facts, I want to put also the ideas of the movement; because facts are only useful in so far as they illustrate ideas. The facts are simply the body; the idea of a movement is its animating soul. But when I speak of the idea of the movement, you must not suppose that I mean something which flashed into the mind of James Stuart, or any one else, one fine morning. The idea of the movement is continually changing and enlarging as the movement goes on. Just as with your children at home, while their bodies are growing their minds also are growing, so while the facts of the University Extension movement in the last fifteen or seventeen years have been expanding and becoming more various, in the same proportion the idea of the University Extension movement has broadened and become deeper.

What, then, is the idea of the University Extension movement, as we understand it at this date? We may first just read an official description. "The purpose of the University Extension movement is to provide the means of higher education for persons of all classes and of both sexes engaged in the regular occupations of life. It is, in fact, an attempt to solve the problem of how much of what the universities do for their own students can be done for persons unable to go to a university." That is the official description of the purpose of this movement. My own definition is shorter: University Extension means "University Education for the Whole Nation, organized upon Itinerant lines." That will be the text of all I have to say to you.



But every single phrase in that definition will want careful explanation. And first, that phrase, "University education." I think it is quite possible that if some of you go out into the streets and try to get adherents among your neighbors for this movement, and talk of "University education" for the whole people, they may find that this idea is not very attractive. I am quite sure of this: That if twenty years ago in England we had announced University education for the masses, we should have seemed to have been advocating a somewhat impracticable thing, very much as if we had proposed a means of promoting a late hour for dinner. People would have said, "Dining late may be very well for people of a certain class; it suits them; but the people in general could not manage it, and if they could, they would not gain much by it." If we had announced University education for the whole nation twenty years ago, that would have been the sort of reception our message would have met with in very many quarters.

To guard against any misapprehension of that kind, let me begin by saying what may astonish some of you, and for aught I know may shock some of you—that University education, as I understand it, has nothing to do with universities. I mean that University education has no necessary connection with universities. I am happy to say that, as a matter of fact, University extension in England has had a great deal to do with the universities. The old "fossilized universities" of Cambridge and Oxford placed themselves at the very head of this movement called "University Extension:"—I do not say that they rose to the needs of the people, they rather went about rousing the nation to the necessity of that which afterwards they were ready to supply. But though that is true, yet I consider it is also true that University education, and therefore University Extension, has no necessary connection with the particular institutions called universities. As a matter of fact, one of the three great branches of the movement in England is not managed by a university—the branch which provides for the great wants of the vast area of London; this is directed by an association, which simply goes to the different universities for lecturers, just as you go to a grocery store to provide your household.

If, then, University education has no essential connection with universities, what does it mean? you will ask. I take it that you must define University education in antithesis to school education. As I understand the matter, school education belongs to young people; university education belongs to adults, to the busy. School education is, in the nature of things, compulsory—it is administered under discipline; University education is pre-eminently voluntary. School education is, in the nature of things, limited. It is limited with regard to age, being given only to young people; whereas University education begins where school education leaves off. School education is still more limited with regard to its purpose, which is to bring up a boy or a girl to such measure of education as is expected in the rank of life to which the boy or girl belongs. If he is to be in one rank of life, he must at least know reading, writing and arithmetic, and a little more; or else he will be at a disadvantage with his companions and an ignorant fellow. If he is going to move in another rank of life, he must have the training suitable to that rank, or he will be put down as uneducated. I grant you, of course, that schools often, and very properly, do a great deal more than this. But I say the essential purpose of school education is limited to bringing a boy or a girl just up to that which is expected of them in the rank of life to which they belong.

But University education is absolutely unlimited. It is not only unlimited in its range, but it has no limit of age; it belongs to a man's whole life. I grant that your connection with some particular university institution may come to an end at the age of five and twenty or six and twenty; but that university has failed miserably in its duty if it does not give you those tastes and those mental habits which will lead you to go on and work for yourself mentally to the very end of your days. We hear sometimes of finishing schools. I never heard of a finishing university. The essence of University education is that it is education for adults; it is voluntary, it is unlimited in scope, unlimited in age; it applies to a man's whole life. If that be the true view of University education, you will see that it has no necessary connection with universities, but it is equally the interest of all adults who have a desire to take part in it.



The main basis, the foundation for this great movement of University Extension, is a fact—the fact that a change has come over the attitude of public opinion with regard to this matter of adult education; that whereas in the past higher education was taken for granted as being the property of a class, and education in the case of the masses was supposed to come to an end with the school age, and in the case only of a very few to go on to the adult period;—a change is coming over the public mind which makes education one of the permanent interests of our whole life, and side by side, shall I say, with religion and politics, the interest of every good citizen.

And this is one of the great revolutions, which, when you see them from a sufficient distance, make up our history. You know, if you go back far enough, there was a time when religion itself was regarded as a thing for the few; only the clergy were to think on those matters, and the rest were simply to take what the clergy gave them. Then there came the great revolution of the Reformation, and the whole adult population insisted upon thinking for themselves in religious matters. Again, in Europe at least, there was a time when political matters were supposed to be the property of a class, a governing class, and the great mass of the nation had simply to obey. Then there came the vast political revolutions which have produced modern times, the essence of which is that every adult person considers that he has an interest in political matters, and a right to act for himself as a citizen of the body politic. Happily, we have no revolution this time, but a silent change coming over the body of the whole nation—here you will find it clearly marked, there you will find it only beginning—but anyhow when recognized with an historical eye it is one of the great movements of our history; this tendency of the whole adult population to claim higher education, to claim the life education that belongs to university teaching, and to claim it as the heritage of every good citizen. Just as in political matters every adult person claims to be within the Constitution, so by this new change coming over us every adult person will claim to be within the University, in the sense in which I have defined it.

That is our ground work for University Extension, and in that sense, I say, the movement proposes to extend university education to the whole nation.

This leads me to my second point. When we talk of such education for the "whole nation," we are met, I think, with a good deal of opposition from very practical persons. Persons who are accustomed to raise practical objections will say: "My dear sir, what do you mean by talking that nonsense? Any kind of education, university or otherwise, for the whole nation! How can you possibly deal with that vast mass of different people, some of them with very little previous education, with very little time, with very little leisure or inclination, and other people, clever, with plenty of leisure, well read beforehand—how can you make the same education suitable for all these different varieties of people?" In fact, they say, "It is a sort of communism that you are preaching to us, educational communism, that a university education should be given indiscriminately to the whole nation." Somebody in England made the interesting calculation that if all the wealth of England were put into a common stock and distributed all around equally, every British household would have two hundred pounds a year. The discovery is more interesting than useful. But, I fancy, when we talk about University education for the whole nation, our practical friends think it is something like a proposal for giving every household two hundred pounds a year; that it is a communistic proposal. "How can you possibly make the same thing suitable for all this great diversity of people?"

But, surely, that objection is an unreasonable one. When we talk of University education for all classes, we do not mean that every individual will get the same thing out of it. What a man gets out of your University Extension system will depend, of course, on what he brings to it. I take it that University Extension will be a sort of stream that runs from the mountain tops of the University or similar institutions: the stream flows from this height over the whole land, and everybody helps himself as he wishes, or as he can. One man helps himself with no more than a cup, another man takes a bucket, one man finds a cistern



is necessary to supply his wants. Each helps himself and can help himself only according to his own capacity. What you have to do is to see that the water is pure.

So I claim that our movement is not a mere theorist's dream. It is a perfectly practical thing that this university education should be extended to the whole nation without exception. But that objection of the practical person leads to a very practical point. As soon as you come to put your system into operation you will be met at once by a great practical dilemma, and a good deal of the success of this scheme will depend on how you deal with this. You will be advised from opposite quarters. On the one side some one will say, "Now, whatever we do, let us see that our University Extension education is every bit as good as that they give in universities; let us have no lowering of the standard, but let us make the education outside and within the university exactly the same." You at once feel a sympathy with that advice. But then somebody will advise you in quite the opposite direction. They say, "We want nothing of the kind. Our business is to go where we are most needed, and consider the neglected classes of the community. We must be content with a make-shift education, the best we can do, the best they can take; and we must leave all those fancy schemes, and just adapt ourselves to the most neglected classes, and find out how little is sufficient to draw them." And you have sympathy with that also. How are you to decide between these opposite policies?

Here, I think, our experience in England may be useful to you. At all events, I will tell you how we have dealt with that fundamental dilemma in a system that is to extend a high thing like university education to the whole nation indiscriminately. We have done this: we have said that what a university does for its own students is two-fold. On the one hand, the university has to teach, and, of course, it follows that its teaching is to be as thorough and its standard as high as is possible. But besides the duty of teaching, the university has also the duty of deciding what ought to be taught—the curriculum, as it is called. If any body is charged with granting degrees, that body has cast



upon it the most important duty of considering what course of study, what combination of subjects, and in what order, will make a fitting preparation for a degree in a given course of liberal education. Those are two main duties of a university—method and curriculum.

Now, in their application to University Extension, you can keep those two things quite distinct. And our solution of the difficulty in England is that, so far as regards method, our system shall be as thorough outside the university as in it. We will not relax one inch. Our standard of University Extension teaching shall be as high as—personally, I go further, I say higher than—that of the universities themselves. But when you come to the course of study, the question as to what is to be taught, then, having to serve a vast variety of people with all manner of different requirements, your system must be elastic. And, therefore, we get, to begin with, a “unit,” as we call it. Our unit is a three months’ course of instruction in a single subject. And whatever teaching we do in University Extension is given in a combination of units, of these three months’ courses in particular subjects. We say that we are perfectly willing to deal with any local center that is able to take no more than a single unit, and we are anxious to have them. At the same time, where a town has more funds and more demands, we are prepared to combine unit course with unit course in a proper educational sequence. The University of Cambridge has carried such combination to the extent of what is called the Affiliation Course: a regular educational sequence of these unit courses, which are considered the equivalent of a single year at the university, so that those who have gone through the affiliation course in their own locality are admitted to the university as second-year students. And, though that is as far as we have gone at present in England, yet there are several of us who are resolved never to cease until we have brought it about that a complete degree course, equal in every way to the course given in the universities, but administered in University Extension methods, shall be obtainable by University Extension students, no doubt extending over a long term of years, but obtainable by them through the system of University Extension.

That being so, you see how we have solved this difficulty. What a university does for its students is method, curriculum. In method we have resolved to be as thorough or even more thorough than in the universities themselves; but so far as curriculum goes, we must be elastic. We fix upon our unit system of the single term in the single subject. We make our combination of units. We contemplate going as far as a complete degree course followed by degrees. And each locality must take advantage of our system so far as its wants permit.

But, now, I want to dwell a little longer upon what I dare say astonishes some of you. I say that the system is as thorough as, or more thorough than, that in the universities themselves. I want to speak about the University Extension method of teaching, putting it to you as an addition to the apparatus of education. Its elements are Lectures, Class, Syllabus, Weekly Exercises, Examinations, Certificates. And in England there is no University Extension teaching which does not imply all these.

Let me describe, as a lecturer, the method that is followed. First, with regard to the Lectures. We expect the audience at our lectures to be as miscellaneous as the congregation of a church. That is a very important point. Some people imagine that University Extension is only for people who are already cultured; other people imagine that University Extension is a system of education for the working classes. I utterly repudiate such descriptions. We know nothing about social classes in University Extension. We wish our audience to include all kinds of people, all ages, all degrees of previous education. If there is anybody who will be out of place in the congregation of a church, that person would be out of place in our lecture audience, but nobody else. It is quite true that in some centers, owing to the particular locality, or the subject, or the lecturer's personality, you will find audiences composed almost entirely of mechanics, or of artisans. We are delighted to have it so. Some great triumphs have been won in centers of that kind. But it is a mistake to suppose that this is a movement simply for mechanics—for the working classes. It is for all classes.

alike. And, taking the movement all over England, we do actually get all classes represented in our lecture audiences.

But we assume that in any audience there will be a nucleus of students, or persons who desire to do something besides attending the lectures; and our theory is, and practice confirms it, that the large audience and the nucleus of students will mutually benefit by being united. What we do for our students is conveyed in the Syllabus. The Syllabus contains the lecturer's own outline for the whole work of his course. We do not expect to teach in the lectures. That is a common error. Although I am a lecturer, I do not believe in lectures as a mode of teaching. The purpose of a lecture is quite different: it is to stimulate persons to learn. The lecturer's business is not to give information, which is much better obtained from books. His duty in the lecture is to stimulate, to put the right points of view, to stir his hearers up to search for themselves. And the Syllabus guides the student in his work to the books which are required.

The students attend the lecture to-day, for example. They go home, and with the aid of their syllabus they read and get information on the subject. Then we have what are called Weekly Exercises—weekly papers they are called here—but I prefer the term exercises. A set of questions will be found in the Syllabus, and all students are invited to answer those questions at home, and send the results in to the lecturer. I want to lay stress upon these Exercises. They are entirely different from examinations. They are entirely different—so far as I, a stranger, can understand—from what are called in this country “quizzes.” Because, I imagine, in the case of quizzes, and, certainly in examinations, such things are mainly exercises for the memory. But that is just what the Weekly Exercises are not. They are done by the student at his own home, at his own leisure. He takes just what time he likes. He makes whatever use he can of books and papers and any kind of information he can lay hold of. “Why,” somebody will say, “if you leave him to do them at home, he will get somebody to help him.” Of course he will, and that is what we want; we want him to get all the help from all the sources he can. In fact, we want him to work just as if



he was investigating for himself. If you were studying some subject, investigating some subject for yourself, would you not use books and papers and instruments? Would you not ransack libraries? Would you not pick the brains of everybody that knew more about it than yourself? That is just what we want our students to do in Weekly Exercises—get all the help they possibly can. They are not exercises to see how much he remembers, but they are simply intended to train him to work for himself.

The student does these exercises, and he sends them in to the lecturer, and the lecturer's business is to make comments in the margin, keeping up, as it were, a regular conversation with the student. Then the next week there is the "Class," which is held on the day of the next lecture, either before or after the lecture. There the lecturer meets the students who have been sending papers in to him, and also as many others as like to come, and he occupies that hour in any way he pleases, but usually in talking about the points that have arisen in the exercises that students have sent in to him. For example, when I am examining a student's exercise, I make a point of noting down everything that is at all out of the common. It may be a misunderstanding; it may be a brilliant saying—I get a great many of them. It may be some unexpected side light on the matter from some person who has special experience. And I take care that the whole class has the full benefit of what everybody has said. I do not mention names; everything that is sent in is received in sacred confidence. But, I assure you, it is an immense stimulus to a student—very often a shy, quiet person—to hear some remark he has put in his paper quoted to the whole class, even without his name, and to see the start of admiration over the whole room. And we are often equally delighted to people who make a mistake: a good, rattling mistake serves to clear up a matter for a lot of people who are too lazy to make the mistake themselves. Besides, mistakes are good preparation for further teaching. Suppose, after a lecture on Marlowe's "Faustus," I ask for a description of the final scene. I am quite sure that half the students who attempt that would make a mess of it.

That is precisely what I want: they imagine that all the dramatic setting can be put in by each reader according to his own taste, whereas I should be able to show in class, line by line, word by word, that I did not put anything into my description of that scene which was not necessarily implied in the wording of the author. Moreover, I should branch out into "dramatic background" in general from this example, and should show other samples of similar treatment, until by the end of the class students would feel that they had known all about dramatic background all their life. "Well," you say, "you could do all this in a lecture." So I could; but it would not make the same difference to the student: the fact of his having attempted and failed, would make my remarks on the subject come to him with ten-fold effect.

Again, I set original questions; I mean questions involving original investigation and creative work. When I lecture upon Goethe's *Faust*, I never fail to put one question in the last paper—"Sketch an original epilogue to Faust." You know Goethe gives a "prologue in heaven," but no epilogue. Now, I say, sketch an original "epilogue in heaven" in order to bring out what you think about the working of the story. That draws most valuable answers. Of course, I read them all out in class, and I have known people converted to belief in University Extension by attending such classes. I recall a very distinguished man in England, who was present in one when I read out answers of this kind, and he came to me afterwards and said: "Well, I did not think much of your lecture, but I do think a great deal of the class. I never conceived that you got such work out of people in University Extension." And he went on to say, what practically came to this, that he would never laugh at University Extension again.

I wanted to speak freely and at length on this subject, because I wish you to realize this, which is the strength of our system—the free Weekly Exercises of the students given at their own home.

Now comes the key to our whole method: Whatever we give by way of Certificates is given upon a combination of the

Weekly Exercises and the Examination at the end. We never give certificates for examinations. I am quite sure, if you knew as much as I do of examinations, you would not have much belief in them. However, people in England have a belief in them, unfortunately. But what we do is to make our Certificates depend equally upon the lecturers' reports of the exercises throughout the term, and the result of a final examination. There are some people who can do well at examinations; there are other people who do not. But there are some people who do splendid work in the weekly exercises, which are more valuable than anything that can be given in examination. Each party gets a chance. Different sets of mental operations are brought into play, and the result is that our Certificates come nearer to what certificates should be, I believe, than any others. Now that is the method on which we work.

But then, the *proof* of the pudding must be, of course, in the eating, and you must consider every educational method by its success. What success have we had? In the first place, we have succeeded in getting hold of the people we want. It is a fact, right through England, that our lecture audiences are as miscellaneous as the congregation of a church. It is equally true that those who do paper work, our students, are miscellaneous in the same way. I have known in one case one-third of the lecture audience, generally one-fifth, and sometimes a smaller proportion, do the weekly exercises. And there is as much miscellaneousness in the weekly exercises as in the audience. For example, I have had exercises sent in by high university graduates who happened to be attending the lectures and were interested and delighted to fight their old battles over again. And I have had weekly exercises from children who wrote in round text. I have had many exercises from people who knew the subject better than I did myself, and I have also had exercises every week from people who could not spell, and whose grammar was very questionable. I have had occasional exercises—and very bright ones, suggesting something for the class—written on post cards; and on the other hand I am quite accustomed to have exercises from thirty to thirty-five or forty pages of quarto



I recollect one case in which I had, week after week, from one student, fifty folio pages of notes in close writing and small. I regret to be obliged to add that that student was mad. But this shows we have actually tapped all strata of English society, not excepting the lunatic asylum.

And with regard to the standard of our work, it is enough to say that there is a general consensus of opinion among all who have had to do with our work, that the standard of our work is precisely the same as the standard of the university itself. I am talking now of the result of final examinations—to my mind, not the most important test; but even judging by the final examination, we have had it said again and again that our “pass” students are just as good as the “pass” students of the university, our “distinction” students in the University Extension are just as good as the honor students in the universities. Indeed, I was very much struck with the remark of one person, a most distinguished teacher in a university and one who also lectured for our Extension movement. I heard him once describe an interesting line of work he had been following, and with an eye to business I said, “Come now, can’t you give us that in a course of University Extension?” He instantly became grave. “Well, no,” he said, “I have not thought it out sufficiently for that.” Then he added, “You know, anything does for college, but when I have to go before a University Extension audience, and have the weekly exercises and the class to provide for, I must have thought out my subject before I face them.” This is just a specimen of the impression of thoroughness made by our method of teaching.

But in reality the most important results are very much oftener those which cannot be put into statistical form, and cannot be tabulated. What I attach as much importance to as anything else is this, that in almost every quarter of England into which we go and give a three months’ course of lectures by experienced lecturers, we are certain in that town to hear it said that the whole character of conversation and intercourse between people has been altered for the three months. We hear from the librarians of the public libraries: “Why, since Mr. So-and-

So has been lecturing, the character of the demand in our libraries has been all changed." We have it said that at five o'clock teas—I suppose that is an American institution as well as English—the character of talk is completely altered. Now, I put it to you, that if you are able to go into some district and lecture, say on "Paradise Lost," for three months, and know that the whole character of the conversation in that district will be materially affected by that course—if you know that you can keep the attention of that locality upon "Paradise Lost" for three months together, that alone constitutes a great educational achievement.

That is what I have to say with regard to the method of University Extension. I have said it means University Extension for the whole nation, and I have tried to show that you can have an elastic system reaching the whole nation, a sort of ladder or educational machinery, of which the lowest rung is the single course of three months, and the highest round is to be a complete university course. I have shown that you can have this administered with complete university thoroughness.

But now I come to my last point—the education of the whole nation is to be organized upon itinerant lines. It is very important to add this, in order to keep University Extension distinct from other good movements of the same kind.

You have in this country some work of the most valuable description. You are far ahead of us English people in the matter of work that consists of home reading and study. That is most excellent work. Do not imagine that I am depreciating it for a moment. But I put it to you that it is very desirable to keep that quite distinct from "University Extension," the distinguishing feature of which is the lecturing. Whatever body is at the head of a "University Extension" movement, that body must be responsible for the teaching, and it can only do this by an itinerant system. It must send these itinerant teachers throughout the community. Organize as you will, in the ultimate result your teaching will vary with your teachers.

Then, one other point is implied in an itinerant organization, and this is that you must have both a Central and Local

organization. You must have a central body to direct, and in each locality some local institution of some kind to take advantage of the movement. I mention this in order to urge upon you this point—do not imagine that the local committee or institution is of small importance, that its duty is simply to turn on a tap, and let the stream flow to its neighborhood. We find in England that the working of the movement depends quite as much upon the local organization as upon the central body.

Then my next point with respect to itinerancy is this—both the local organization and the central organization will need funds; money of some kind. We in England have tried, have ransacked every form of contrivance, in order to make the movement pay itself—I mean pay itself out of the fees and tickets of the students who attend the lectures; and we have failed. We have come to the conclusion that while an individual course may not only succeed, but bring in a handsome profit, yet, taking one course with another, one district with another, you cannot possibly expect to pay, from the fees of those who attend, more than two-thirds, at the outside, of your expenses. And even that is where you are only taking the lowest round of the ladder, the single course. The difference between that unit course and the complete college or university course is simply one of finance. And therefore the strength of your movement will lie ultimately in its financial organization. In these matters, you know, thinkers propose, but finance disposes; and you will have to address yourselves to that important topic—how to provide in one form or another an endowment for this movement. I do not know whether the term “endowment” is an unwelcome term to you. In England it creates quite a prejudice, but the fact remains that, call it by whatever name you will, somehow or other you will have to find some money to supplement the tickets and fees of those who attend. Both the local societies and the central body will want such subscriptions as you are invited to give to-night.

We have come to the conclusion in England that not only is this true as a fact, but further, as a matter of principle, that the movement *ought not* to pay itself from the fees of those who



attend. For this reason—it professes to be a movement of higher education. Now, you may almost define higher education by saying that it is education that has no market value. If you find year after year and term after term that your movement can be paid for out of the fees of the students, then you know that you are not giving a high enough education. Again, you may be quite sure of this, that if you attempt to make the movement do without endowment you will limit it. You will have to keep on the lowest round of the ladder; or you will limit it in a worse way—you will have to make your tickets high priced, and therefore keep out the very persons you most wish to benefit.

But I take broader ground. The movement is a missionary movement. And can you think of establishing missions without funds to back them? I want to appeal to you strongly on this point—the more strongly because some people do not realize what a grand thing subscribing is. Let me explain what I mean. Everybody realizes—it does not need any explanation—what a grand thing endowment is. Your nation is quite wonderful in the number of rich men who have left vast sums to endow whole universities and schools. It impresses an Englishman that you always reckon by millions; it sounds overpowering. Every one feels the grandeur of that; but people do not feel the grandeur of subscribing five dollars and getting others besides themselves to subscribe similar sums. It may be a shocking thing to say, but it seems to me that, speaking generally, subscribing is a higher thing than bequeathing. Of course, it is on a smaller scale; but I often think about those who have left these grand sums to public objects—and of course they have done a good thing—that they enjoyed the money the whole time of their lives, and, when they could get no more out of it, then they gave it to public objects. That is a good thing to do, but they gave it away, not for themselves, but from their successors. Now, everybody who makes an annual subscription of five dollars or more is not giving it away from his heirs or successors, but he is giving it from himself. Thus those who become members of this association, and who get other people to become members, and canvass heartily for it, are to my mind doing exactly the

same thing on a smaller scale as those great citizens who have left vast sums to found universities; and, to my mind, they are doing it in a better way, because they are assisting their own generation and at their own expense.

This is the one word that I want to leave with you this word "missionary spirit." University Extension is pre-eminently a missionary movement. And I want to wipe away the reproach that at present rests upon higher education, that it is selfish compared with the other great interests of life. When a man feels strongly upon religious matters, the first thing he does is to set about converting others. When a man has views on politics, the first thing he does is to agitate and bring others to his views. But in the past I am afraid it has been true that culture has been selfish, so much so that in England the very word has become hateful—the word "culture" has come to signify an exclusive and selfish spirit, with "Get away from me, I am more cultured than thou" for its motto. That has been the spirit of culture in the past. Now, we think that one of the missions of University Extension is to wipe away that reproach, to call upon everybody who is conscious of having been educated, who is conscious of an interest in intellectual matters, to feel that this very sense of culture is an obligation upon him to go out and help others to be cultured. To infuse a missionary spirit into culture—that is the purpose of University Extension.

